

REMARKS

In the response to arguments on page 2 of the final rejection, it is suggested that in Walley there are multiple networks as each base station is capable of communicating with wireless, connected mobile devices. No support is cited for this proposition.

The proposition is surprising since it is directly inconsistent with what the inventor Walley describes. Walley is explicit that he has one and only one network. That network is the network 100 which he describes as including three bases, BS1, BS2, and BS3. Thus, the cited reference is directly contrary to the position taken by the Examiner. An interpretation of the reference, which is totally inconsistent with the reference itself, cannot be sustained.


Therefore, reconsideration is requested.

Walley never faces the problem of communicating address information between two different networks. He only has one network and whatever he communicates he communicates within that network. He does not have the problem that a first network has devices enumerated in it and a second network devices enumerated in it and the first and the second device networks have no way to know what devices are in the other network.

Since Walley does not teach a solution to the problem claimed and the assertion that Walley teaches distinct networks is irreconcilable with the reference itself, the rejection should be reconsidered.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 22, 2006



Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation